

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,483	01/09/2004	Sumio Okuno	648.41258CX1	6885
20457 75	590 04/19/2005		EXAM	INER
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP			JULES, FRANTZ F	
1300 NORTH S SUITE 1800	SEVENTEENTH STREE	Т	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	VA 22209-3873		3617	
			DATE MAIL ED. 04/10/2001	-

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	'	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/753,483	OKUNO ET AL.	1
Office Action Summ	ary E	Examiner	Art Unit	
	F	Frantz F. Jules	3617	
The MAILING DATE of this of Period for Reply	communication appea	rs on the cover sheet w	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS CO  - Extensions of time may be available under the after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of  - If the period for reply specified above is less the  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the mr  - Failure to reply within the set or extended perion  - Any reply received by the Office later than three  - earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1	MMUNICATION. provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(e f this communication. an thirty (30) days, a reply wil aximum statutory period will a od for reply will, by statute, ca e months after the mailing da	a). In no event, however, may a thin the statutory minimum of th apply and will expire SIX (6) MC use the application to become A	reply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this community  NBANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)	cation.
Status				
1) Responsive to communication	on(s) filed on .			
2a) This action is FINAL.		tion is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in co	ondition for allowance	e except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the meri	ts is
closed in accordance with the	e practice under <i>Ex j</i>	parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-10 and 12</u> is/a		*		
4a) Of the above claim(s)		from consideration.		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 6-9</u> is/are a 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10 and 12</u> is/are reje		•	•	
7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objecte				
8) Claim(s) are subject to		lection requirement.		
Application Papers		·		
9)☐ The specification is objected t	o by the Eveminer			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on	•	ed or b) Objected to	by the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that a				
			g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	21(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is obj	ected to by the Exam	niner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-15	2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a	ne of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. ☐ Certified copies of the	· -			
2. ☐ Certified copies of the 3. ☐ Copies of the certified			· ·	
application from the Int			received in this National Stage	;
* See the attached detailed Office	•	• • • •	received.	
Attachment(s)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing R	Pavious (PTO 040)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing R     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date			Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
S. Patent and Trademark Office TOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)	Office Action	Summary	Part of Paper No /Mail Date 041	 52005

Application/Control Number: 10/753,483 Page 2

Art Unit: 3617

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashima et al (US 6,196,135) in view of Pavlick et al (US 4,715,292) and Torke (US 3,983,962).

Kashima et al teach all the limitations of claims 10 and 12 except for a railway car in which the underframe of both end of the car constituting a portion of a passenger room are made of softer material formed by annealing. The general concept of providing shock absorbing material to both end of a railcar constitutes an obvious duplication of parts and is well known in the art as illustrated by Pavlick et al which disclose the teaching of providing shock absorbing material to both end of a passenger rail car.

Also, the general concept of using the process of annealing a material used in a vehicle for the purpose of absorbing energy is well known in the art as illustrated by Torke which discloses the use of annealing process in the softening a frame member used for energy absorbing purpose, see fig. 1, col. 1, lines 5-8, lines 48-51, lines 55-57, lines 64-68. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kashima et al to include the use of providing both end of the car constituting a portion of a passenger room with a material made of softer or impact

Art Unit: 3617

absorbing material in his advantageous railway car as taught by Pavlick et al in order to provide safety for the passengers in case of an accident. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kashima et al to include the use of material softened by annealing process in both longitudinal ends of the underframe of the railway car as taught by Torke in order to increase the buckling resistance of the frame member, prevent perpendicular extension of corrugation to the bending edge of the frame members thereby increasing safety during a collision.

# Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9 stand allowable.

## Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 02/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the allowance of claims 1-4, 6-9 and of the new ground of rejection. Applicant's argument that Pavlick et al fails to disclose material that shrink at the underframe of a portion of a passenger room is weak as the Pavlick et al reference clearly provides a teaching of material that shrink in the underframe of "a portion of a passenger room" where the crew members would be located.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz F. Jules whose telephone number is (703) 308-8780. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

**Art Unit: 3617** 

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph S. Morano can be reached on (703) 308-0230. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantz F. Jules Primary Examiner Art Unit 3617

**FFJ** 

April 15, 2005

FRANTZ F. JULES
PRIMARY EXAMINED